DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 188 SP 017 014

AUTHOR Yarger, Sam J.; Mertens, Sally K.
TITLE About the Education of Teachers--A Letter to Virginia.
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Quality Inservice Education, sponsored by the National Council of States on Inservice Education (New Orleans, LA, November, 1976).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; Continuing Education; Delivery Systems; *Developmental Stages; *Faculty Development; Governance; Lifelong Learning; Postsecondary Education; Program Budgeting; *Program Development; *Sequential Approach; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

Teachers progress through stages of professional development chronologically and sequentially. To provide continuous professional development, these stages should be identified and programs effective for each stage offered. The pre-education student needs introductory and experiential programing. This presents an opportunity for assessing the merits or drawbacks of choosing a career as a teacher. A program for the education student is weighted toward foundations of education, methodology, theory, and clinical experience. The beginning teacher requires an intensive clinical program focusing on acquiring new skills and on filling the gaps that may occur between the theory of the university and the practice of the classroom. Programing for a developing teacher may be related to upward change in a career, as well as obtaining further credentials and continuing to acquire new skills. Inservice programs for experienced teachers continue the development of teaching skills, may be related to preparation for a new position, are assumed to be internally motivated, and can also be developed for returning teachers. Four issues must be considered when developing these sequential programs: the authority under which the program operates; the credibility of the program for a particular stage of development; the funding of the program; and the governance of the program. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199188

ABOUT THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS--
A LETTER TO VIRGINIA

SAM J. YARGER

SALLY K. MERTENS

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

PRESENTED AT

THE CONFERENCE ON QUALITY INSERVICE EDUCATION

SPONSORED BY

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATES ON INSERVICE EDUCATION

NEW ORLEANS

NOVEMBER 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sally K. Mertens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017 014

Dear Virginia,

Your letter of inquiry resembles in many ways a letter we received several years back. The writer of that letter was also very concerned about the reality of a concept that seemed to promise something for everyone; the writer of that letter, coincidentally, was also named Virginia. Your recent letter reminded us of how difficult it was to answer that Virginia's question, "Is there a Santa Claus?" One vocal segment of our staff urged that we send an autographed picture of Santa to Virginia. After much debate however a hard-nosed approach was agreed upon: we responded that we could not document the reality of the man in the red suit bearing gifts for all. However, we did attest to the reality of the spirit of giving and sharing that Santa represents and we encouraged Virginia to enjoy this spirit--to join in and further strengthen its prevelance.

Now, in response to your question: "Is there a delivery model for the professional development of teachers that effectively bridges preservice and inservice teacher education?" We regret, Virginia, that we must also answer your inquiry in the negative. While we can certainly document a spirit and a flurry of activity to provide for this "continuous professional development," we believe this concept is essentially hollow at the present time and waiting for attributes. Hopefully, this does not imply that we do not believe in the idea; quite the contrary, we highly value this concept and we encourage you to join us in our ongoing effort to better understand it. While we suspect you had hoped for and expected an unambiguous, affirmative

response to your question, complete with documentation, we hope that you will understand our using this response as an opportunity to present what we see as some of the problems in operationalizing this concept. First we must understand the difficulties; hopefully, this understanding will provide a platform for rethinking the total enterprise of preservice and inservice teacher education.

The development of systems that provide for continuous professional development of teachers is not, by the way, a new idea; neither is how to do it a new problem. It is essentially the old problem of bridging theory, the historical bailiwick of preservice education, and practice, the historical focus of inservice education. The bridging solution, with many variations on the theme, has typically been to provide more practical experiences in schools for preservice teachers and to encourage additional coursework for inservice teachers. A particularly curious variation bridges the gap by reducing the distance between campus and schools. Preservice and inservice teachers participate in both the theoretical and practical components of teacher education in a common field location. This physical locus shift, however, has not altered the traditional emphases which continue to be on the amount of "time spent" and/or the number of "courses taken." It is generally assumed that more is better. While a vigorous, idealistic spirit has certainly propelled these programs, nobody is quite sure that anybody has been provided with anything, much less that both preservice and inservice teachers have substantively benefitted. While some of these attempts to bridge the gap between preservice and inservice teacher education have been successful, too

many have come too close to delivering on Broudy's fear that in attempts to integrate theory and practice, theory will be eliminated.[1]

Attempts to provide for continuous professional development of teachers have additionally suffered from program types that approach either of two extremes. One type is based on the assumption that all teachers, preservice and inservice as well, are alike only in that their needs are idiosyncratic. Programs based on this assumption typically mature and "improve" by developing individualized courses and experiences to "respond" to these needs as they are, or happen to be, identified. At the other extreme are programs based on the assumption that all teachers, preservice and inservice, can benefit from similar courses and experiences. It is believed continuous professional development is provided for by encouraging teachers to periodically engage in a relatively stable program of fundamental courses and experiences, generally taking the form of master's level courses.

Virginia, lest we sound too cynical, some of the programs for reducing the gap have been effective. However, we believe that these effective programs have been isolated exceptions rather than the rule, and have been serendipitous, rather than part of a carefully planned program. We contend that at the present time there is little existing rationale for encouraging teacher educators to engage in additional attempts to bridge this still highly-visible gap. Like the bulk of

---

[1]Harry S. Broudy, A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education (Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May 1972), p. 2.

previous endeavors, future efforts are most likely to be exercises in frustration and futility. It is our contention that before effective bridging should be even contemplated, the nature of the gap between preservice and inservice must be better understood.

Toward an Understanding of the Gap

We strongly suspect that teachers progress through certain stages on a continuum of teacher development. However, in the urgency to bridge the gap between preservice and inservice this continuum has been virtually ignored by researchers and program developers alike. Logic demands that before "continuous" professional development of teachers can be seriously considered, these stages on the continuum must first be identified. As a beginning we have identified five stages. We hope that a delineation of these stages will ward off any future temptations to consider teachers either as a dichotomous population, preservice-inservice, or even worse, as a homogenous population. We believe that a delineation of these stages will highlight the need for different types of programming for teachers at the different stages. We believe that a delineation of these stages will also set some parameters within which differences and variations exhibited by individuals can be better comprehended and provided for.

All teachers progress through these stages chronologically and sequentially. Whether or not they develop professionally is a different question. The answer will be primarily determined by the appropriateness of teacher education programming at the various stages.

Figure 1 is a graphic representation of the sequential stages of the teaching career and the program focus areas that we believe are appropriate for each of the five stages.

The Sequential Stages and Suggested Focus Areas

Stage 1. The preeducation student is typically an underclassman who, though exploring, is not committed to a teaching career. We say "typically" because teaching careers can be explored by people at many different points during life. Programming at this stage should provide an opportunity for the student to test out preconceptions regarding teaching. It should help students better understand teaching, and better understand the decisions they are attempting to make.

> Introductory Programming. Introductory programming is characterized by its comprehensiveness in introducing the student to what teaching and education are about. It is not seen as part of a professional training program; it may or may not offer college credit. While this probably would not be required for entrance into a professional program, it would be strongly recommended.
>
> Experiential Programming. Experiential programming is designed to complement the "introductory programming;" it provides the student with a chance to view on a first-hand basis the concepts that are being explored. It is almost exclusively a program of focused observations in schools and classrooms, with minimal interaction with students, if there is any interaction at all. Some form of career counseling would be offered concurrently with this experiential programming.

Stage 2. The education student has already made a conscious and serious decision to become a teaching professional. We'll typically find these students in the upper class years of undergraduate

Stage				
1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Education Student	Education Student	Initial Teacher	Developing Teacher	Experienced Teacher
Introductory Programming • Not part of professional program • Low substance, high comprehensiveness • Credit or non-credit • Not required for entrance into professional program Experiential Programming • Complementary to introductory prog. • Overwhelmingly observational • Concurrent career counseling	Content Programming • Discipline oriented • Not related to teaching application Foundational Prog. • Traditional foundational areas • Noninstructional interactive skills • Concurrent field observations Methodological/Pedagogical Prog. • Learns about how to teach • Child-free practice with peers • Concurrent field observations Initial Clinical Prog. • Demonstrate with sm.groups of stud. • Sheltered environ. • Less intensive than traditional stud. teaching	Content Programming • Discipline oriented • Not related to tchg.application Additive/Discrepancy Prog. • Acquire new skills • Develop existing skills • Includes: foundations, methods • May focus on 'gaps' in prev. programs • Motivation may be internal/external • May relate to credential and/or tenure Intensive Clinical/Transitional Prog. • Transition from sheltered to real world environ. • Integration of various skills • Learning professional roles	Content Programming • Discipline oriented • Not related to tchg. application Additive Programming • Acquire new skills • Develop existing skills • Includes: foundations, methods, clinical • Usually internal source of motiv. • May relate to credential/tenure Adjustive Prog. • Usually relates to change • Source of motiv.usually more external Career Change Prog. • Related to preparation for new pos. • May be lateral or upward change • May or may not relate to new credential	Content Programming • Discipline oriented • Not related to tchg. application Additive Programming • Acquire new skills • Develop existing skills • Includes: foundations, methods, clinical • Usually internal source of motiv. Adjustive Programming • Usually related to change • Source of motiv.usually more external • Includes programs for returning tchr. Career Change Prog. • Related to preparation for new pos. • May be lateral or upward change • May or may not relate to new credential

Fig. 1. Sequential Stages and Suggested Focus Areas for Programming in Teacher Education.

school. The four types of programming for education students are seen as rigorous and demanding--this is the start of real professional training.

> Content Programming. This type of programming is specifically selected to help the student learn what it is that he/she will be teaching. It is discipline oriented and is not related to the actual instruction of students.
>
> Foundational Programming. Foundational programming focuses on the traditional foundational areas such as history, philosophy, sociology, and psychology of education. Noninstructional interactive classroom skills such as classroom management, strategies of teaching, and group processes, are also included in foundational programming. Students will practice these skills with their peers, and will observe their occurrence in classroom settings.
>
> Methodological/Pedagogical Programming. This type of programming will help education students learn how to teach. The learning experiences will focus on the translation of content into the appropriate ways of helping children learn. As with interactive skills introduced with foundational programming, students will practice these skills with their peers, and will observe their occurrence in field settings.
>
> Initial Clinical Programming. Finally, toward the end of professional training, students will have the opportunity to demonstrate the interactive, methodological and pedagogical skills they have been learning with small groups of children. This will occur in a sheltered environment, perhaps using techniques such as microteaching. Students will not be asked to manage entire instructional environments, thus making this initial clinical experience somewhat less intensive than we have traditionally viewed student teaching.

While we consider it important to distinguish at least two stages within what had been traditionally called "preservice education," we believe it is imperative, if we are serious in our intent to provide for continuous professional development, to identify the various

stages that teachers progress through as inservice teachers. We contend that teachers progress through three distinguishable stages during their professional career.

Stage 3. The initial teacher is transitioning from the relative security of a training program to the demands of being a full-fledged professional. In a sense, this is still an education student, but in another sense this is a teaching professional. In Great Britain these are called "induction year" teachers. Programming must facilitate the initial teacher in dealing with the difficulties that are typically encountered in the induction year.

> Content Programming. Content programming, as for the education student, is discipline oriented and is not related to the actual instruction of students. It is likely to be quite specific and directly related to the curricula of the employing school district.
>
> Additive/Discrepancy Programming. This transitional programming would help the initial teacher in further developing pedagogical skills. It would also aid the initial teacher in acquiring new teaching skills that weren't provided in the earlier stages. An analysis of the initial teacher's preservice program will surely suggest certain training gaps that will require special programs. Sometimes the initial teacher will select the programs and sometimes others will. There is a strong likelihood that programming during this stage will relate to acquiring a teaching credential.
>
> Intensive Clinical/Transitional Programming. It is generally recognized that there are significant problems to be encountered as one moves from the sheltered environment, of for example microteaching, to the real world of the classroom. This type of programming will aid in that transition. There will be a significant amount of clinical help focusing on the ability of the initial teacher to integrate and orchestrate the rather discordant skills they have previously learned. This can only be done within

the context of a real classroom. Finally, the initial teacher will be learning how to perform certain aspects of the professional role that are best taught on the job rather than on the campus.

Stage 4. The developing teacher has completed the transitional phase, but is still a novice professional. There is still much to be learned. The period between the initial experience and the receiving of a high-order credential can be viewed as a period of the developing teacher. There are certain kinds of programming that seem most appropriate for teachers at this stage of career development.

Content Programming. Again, as in other stages, teachers continue to learn about the content they teach.

Additive Programming. Additive programming for the developing teacher is similar to additive/discrepancy programming for the initial teacher. There are, however, two distinguishing elements. Whereas for the initial teacher the decision to become involved in professional development activities may be either self-determined or suggested from an external source, the teacher at this stage will rely more on his/her own judgments to determine the appropriate type of program. Also, there will be less focus on discrepancy programming, i.e., "gaps" in previous training, although there may be some.

Adjustive Programming. Adjustive programming for the developing teacher is a recognition of the fact that things do change. The change may be in the organization of the school, the types of students with whom the teacher deals, or even some greater change that exists within society. Regardless, there will be a need for programming to help teachers adjust to the changes. Although the decision to partake of the programming may be completely that of the developing teacher, the source of the change is usually viewed as external.

Career Change Programming. There are many "specialty areas" in the education professions. Typically, these require advanced training and are of most interest to professionals who started their

careers as teachers. Career change programming, then, is related to the preparation for a new professional. It may or may not relate to a new credential.

Stage 5. Experienced teachers are those who have completed all the requirements for the highest-order teaching credential. This group has at least three to five years teaching experience. Programming for experienced teachers, although similar to that for "developing teachers," is different. Obviously at any given time there are more teachers to be considered at Stage 5 than at Stage 4. Furthermore, content, additive and adjustive programming is probably even more important for teachers at Stage 5 than for teachers at Stage 4. It is typical that experienced teachers, having achieved relative security and success as "developing" teachers, are eager to broaden their professional experience. It is this group that is most likely to express interest in innovative approaches, and in working with other groups of children, in other content areas and even other schools. This interest is usually unrelated to career change or attainment of additional credentials.

Content Programming. Even professionals with many years experience must continue to learn about the things they teach. The explosion of knowledge in most content areas necessitates this.

Additive Programming. Additive programming is similar to that which was described for the developing teacher, with one exception. Typically, additive programming for experienced teachers will not be related to the acquiring of a credential. This, obviously, will place the onus for determination of involvement almost exclusively on the individual teacher.

Adjustive Programming. Adjustive programming for the experienced teacher is similar to that for the developing teacher. Additionally, programming for

teachers who are returning to the profession after a period of inactivity would be included in this area.

Career Change Programming. Career change programming for the experienced teacher is identical to that of for the developing teacher.

We suspect that there are stages within the stage of the experienced teacher. It may well be necessary to delineate this further as we arrive at a better understanding of program development for those who have taught for many years. At this time, however, we simply don't understand the training needs of experienced teachers well enough to make meaningful distinctions.

A Sampler of Issues

Now, Virginia, whether or not teachers will progress to successively higher levels of professional development as they progress through these sequential stages will depend on coherent and cohesive programming. However, while an understanding of this principle is necessary, it's clearly not sufficient for the program developer. The program developer must recognize that the implementation issues that must be identified and dealt with will be very different as a function of the five different stages of teacher development. Any bridge to provide for the continuous development of teachers must consider that the contexts, within which each of the five target populations will receive their education, is dramatically different.

A virtual myriad of issues could be presented when one is talking about the context within which teacher education programs are developed and delivered. We picked just four. We picked these four,

not only because we believed them to be salient issues, but also because we can show how they differentially impact the planning of teacher education programs at the various sequential stages. The issues that we picked include authority, credibility, finance and governance.

Authority refers to the established policies and procedures of legally constituted bodies. These may be embedded in requirements, or regulations, and sometimes they may even be ad hoc. Typically, program legitimacy is derived from the policies put forth by these groups. Certainly, state education departments offer authority for program development by virtue of program accreditation at the institutional level and certification requirements at the individual level. Authority is also inherent at the institutional levels: universities and colleges, for example, have programs that have gone through a faculty approval process; school district programs have authority by virtue of probationary requirements and tenure policies. Additionally, school districts have authority to mandate certain amounts of inservice training. Certainly, a program planner will have more success if the proposed programs tend to be in congruence with established policies and requirements.

The extent to which a program addresses perceived needs, is the extent to which that program has credibility. While there are other kinds of needs as well--substantive needs emanating from information, and political needs emanating from the political process--only perceived needs directly bear on the credibility of the program. Thus,

from a participant's point of view, a program is credible if it appears to relate to that participant's professional life. Obviously, program success will be related to program credibility. It should be noted that while authority and credibility are related in that they are both concerned with the larger issues of program conceptual base, they are distinct. In fact, programs can be credible without possessing authority, and the opposite can occur as well. One might say that authority relates to "institutional credibility," while the credibility we're talking about here is determined from the individual participant's point of view.

Alas, Virginia, we can't escape from the consideration of finances as a major issue in teacher education. Simply stated, finances are concerned with who will pay the tab. As one moves from required programs to more voluntary programs, then the answer to that question and the stability of the program become more tenuous. Historically, there has been a relatively stable, though client-generated financial base, for teacher education programs leading to certification. Institutional support for inservice education, particularly after one accepts a teaching position, has been very limited. It is likely that in the future higher levels of public funding will relate to the question of authority, while the willingness of participants to continue to bear the financial burden, will relate to the issue of credibility. At this particular time in the development of teacher education across our country, the preceding analysis begs the question, as the participants are still bearing the greater amount of direct costs for teacher education.

Finally, and this shouldn't surprise you, governance is a major issue in program planning in teacher education. In this case, we define governance as a structure and process that is concerned with making micropolicy decisions. This type of policy decision, as opposed to macropolicy decisions, provides the most direct type of guidance for teacher education programs; it should also be kept distinct from operational decisions, as these are the realm of program managers and administrators. Generally, the smaller the number of groups involved in micropolicy decisions, the easier the governance process. Frequently, however, there is a trade-off; the greater the number of constituencies involved, the greater the likelihood the program will be accepted. It is unclear what this means in terms of the program planning and implementation process in teacher education, but one would suspect that the goal would be to involve all essential constituencies, at least as they relate to the potential for program success.

The Sequential Stages and the Issues

With this admittedly capsule version of some of the major issues in teacher education program development, it's time to look at what they mean. How important are these issues for teacher educators and how does their importance vary from stage to stage? If you remember, Virginia, we made the point earlier that teachers in training and teachers in service are very different, and that simple linkages between teacher education programs simply haven't existed. Nowhere is that more evident than in a consideration of the issues

vis-à-vis the five stages we've talked about. Figure 2 makes that point quite clearly.

Program planning in the area of the preeducation student occurs almost totally without authority, and without the need for authority. Furthermore, there are no governance issues, as preeducation students are trained almost exclusively within a university or college based program. There are, however, likely to be some financial constraints, as programming for preeducation students will constitute additions to the ongoing academic programs. These constraints, however, are not particularly formidable; the program additions will most likely be tuition-generating, or else borne by the education faculty at the institution. Finally, the issue of credibility looms most important for the preeducation program planner. Given the so-called "over supply of teachers" and the relatively low position of career education, faculty members are going to have to strive to develop preeducation programs that are directed toward meeting the perceived needs of the students. This issue becomes enhanced if one is interested in being able to select only high quality students for entry into professional programs.

Programs for the education student are probably the most constraint-free. The authority for the program is derived from the requirements that are existent in all states for approval of programs leading to the initial teaching credential. Additionally, programs for education students have been in existence for some time, and usually have experienced little difficulty in being approved by the

Issues	Stage				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Pre-Education Student	Education Student	Initial Teacher	Developing Teacher	Experienced Teacher
Authority	0	0	[illegible]	+	++
Credibility	++	0	+	+	++
Finance	+	0	+	+	++
Governance	0	+	++	++	++

0 - Not an issue or an issue of minor importance.

\+ - Issue of importance.

++ - Issue of major importance.

Fig. 2. The Differential Importance of Issues by Sequential Teacher Education Stages.

institutions that house them. Interestingly, finance is not seen as a major problem in planning for education students as these students pay tuition, thus supporting their own program. At the same time, at least in public institutions, state resources are available for this type of programming, and there appears to be no major threat to that source.

Only recently, and only in some areas, has governance become an issue for program planners at this level. As programs for education students have become more field-based, constituents, other than the institutions responsible for these students, have become more interested in program development. Although this is seen as an issue of importance, thus far there is little to suggest that it is a potential major inhibitor for program development.

The plot thickens, Virginia, as we look at the impact of these issues on program planning for the initial teacher. Since this stage of career development is hardly universally recognized, one must speculate a little as to the problem. Authority is not seen as a major problem, as the initial teacher, in many ways, will still be viewed as a student. Consequently, that teacher qua student will be looking for institutional approval as well as be involved in meeting requirements for some type of credential. Credibility is viewed as an issue of importance, as the initial teacher will be experiencing problems in a real classroom, and will expect teacher education programming to be relevant. Finances will probably be an issue at this level, as there is a growing expectation that at least some of the cost of programming

for teachers should be borne by the public. However, since the teacher will be working toward meeting requirements for credentials and perhaps advanced degrees, it is anticipated that the initial teacher will still be expected and be willing to bear at least a portion of the cost. Finally, governance is seen as an issue of major importance. In the instance of the initial teacher the original and/or local training institutions as well as the current employing institutions will have a major voice in program planning and development. The governance issue is one that could become debilitating if care is not taken right from the onset.

Issues surrounding the development of teacher education programs for the <u>developing teacher</u> take on still more importance. This occurs, to a large degree, because as the teacher becomes more experienced and is more involved in professional self-development, that teacher will develop more selectivity in choosing inservice programs This is normal--this is as it should be. However, the teacher is working toward a higher-order credential, and the authority of the state is still in evidence. Likewise, the teacher is likely to be involved in a probationary period vis-à-vis the school district; thus, teacher education programs have some authority at this stage. However, because typically the specific requirements for the advanced certificate as well as the requirements for the probationary period are vague, more teacher selectivity will be in evidence. Credibility therefore is important, because as a teacher becomes more experienced, and more able to articulate development needs, then it will be more

important for the programs to address themselves to those needs. The existence of the authority speaks, in some regards, to the questions of finance. The extent to which involvement in teacher education programming is nonvoluntary is the extent to which one might expect public funds to be utilized. By the same token, and this relates to the initial teacher as well as to the more experienced teacher, if the inservice programming is generating real and concrete rewards for a developing teacher, then there should be an expectation that the teacher would bear the expense. Finally, governance has become a major issue. Not only is the school district involved, but there is a strong likelihood that the teachers' organization and the institution of higher education will be interested. In fact, in recent years there's been a movement toward involving citizens in this process as well. There can be no doubt that governance issues have and will continue to be important in program development for the developing teachers.

Finally, program planning and development for the <u>experienced teacher</u> is the toughest nut to crack. With the exception of the minimal amounts of teacher education programs mandated by the local school districts, there is no clear strategy for involving experienced teachers. While this has started to change across the country as proposals for continuous renewal of credentials have come under consideration, in most states strategies for involving experienced teachers simply do not exist. There is no question that program credibility is a major issue. Teachers need to have strong input into programs if these programs are to be viewed as relevant. With little or no need for further credentialing, and with many of the

experienced teachers already possessing advanced degrees, the question of who should pay for teacher education programs at this stage also becomes paramount. Many recognize the need for continuing development of professional educators, but few have devised strategies for funding programs designed to meet this need. Additionally, teachers at this stage often, quite legitimately, have little desire to spend personal resources. Finally, if one accepts the notion that experienced teachers are well versed in the area of perceiving personal needs, then it only stands to reason that they will ask for their rightful place in the governance process. It is difficult to conceive of program development at this level without control and governance being major issues.

So, hopefully, Virginia, you now have a better understanding of the nature of the gap between preservice and inservice teacher education. It should be clear that at each of the five sequential stages programming needs are different and the salient issues are weighted differentially. Based on our analysis of the gap and our delineation of the stages on the continuum, it appears that education students are the easiest population for which programs can be developed, while experienced teachers present the greatest challenge. The developing teacher presents formidable obstacles, the initial teacher probably fewer. Finally, the preeducation student, though presenting more obstacles than the education student, is probably still fairly easy to develop programs for.

In Closing . . .

Virginia, we have attempted to come to a better understanding of the gap that exists between preservice and inservice education.

It is clear to us that any large-scale efforts to provide for continuous professional development are not likely to be as successful as they should be until the concept of teacher development is better understood. We have taken a first cut toward providing that better understanding. Our hypotheses regarding the sequential stages evident in the early years of the teaching were deductively constructed, and remain to be tested. Hopefully, our efforts will encourage the development and testing of hypotheses regarding the stages of the later career years.

Meanwhile, we feel a strong need to call for a retrenchment of intent. In our enthusiastic attempts to provide something for teachers at all stages of the career continuum we have been forced to spread ourselves so thinly that the success of our efforts is questionable. At this time we believe that we should focus our efforts and our resources on that segment of the teaching population that has the highest potential for success and the highest potential pay-off for teachers and for children. Based on our analysis we believe that at this time we should concentrate on making an effective linkage between Stage 2 programs for the <u>education student</u>, and Stage 3 programs for the <u>initial teacher</u>.

Obviously, Virginia, the job is just beginning. We invite you to join us in this challenging and potentially rewarding venture. If all goes well, the next time a Virginia writes us a letter asking about the education of teachers, we'll be able to pen a shorter and more comprehensive response.

Sincerely,

Sally and Sam